

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections of record in the April 21, 2004 Final *Office Action*.

Status of the Application

All of the pending claims 1-30 in the instant Application stand rejected.

Obviousness Rejection

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C's "Introduction to CSS2," (<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-CSS2/intro.html#processing-model>); hereinafter "*Intro to CSS2*") in view of *Traughber et al.* (WO 98/14896; hereinafter "*Traughber*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is alleged in the instant *Office Action* that *Intro to CSS2* discloses many of the features recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 21. But the *Office Action* also concedes that *Intro to CSS2* fails to teach or suggest "that customizing a requested document is done on the server side" (O.A., pg. 3). In an attempt to show that these claimed features were known, the Examiner applies *Traughber*, taking the position that this secondary reference discloses "that customizing the requested document can be done on the server side (Page 2, lines 3-14)(Fig. 2: 32)" (O.A., pg. 3).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Intro to CSS2* and *Traughber*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that the claimed feature of applying "at least one rule of the

style sheet to the DOM” is performed within a document server (Claim 1) or system (Claim 11), where the style sheet rule is directed to a target device, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Likewise *Intro to CSS2* and *Traughber* fail to teach or suggest an article of manufacture, as recited in Claim 21, having similar features.

Specifically, while *Intro to CSS2* discloses that it utilizes style sheets, it specifies that the style sheets are applied to a parsed source document at the client (i.e., user or target) side, rather than at the recited server or system side. This configuration described in *Intro to CSS2* is similar to the deficient “relevant technology” discussed on pages 1-5 of the instant Application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the *Intro to CSS2* system would suffer from the same problems as the “relevant technology” described in the background section of the Application, i.e., many “user agents” (i.e., web browsers) do not support style sheets.

Traughber fails to correct the deficiencies of *Intro to CSS2*, as it fails to teach or suggest application of style sheets at a server or system side. Rather, *Traughber* discloses that a web server may retrieve a template from memory to create a new HTML page, which is then parsed and processed to embed data therein (pg. 5, lines 17-23). Thus, *Traughber* is directed to the preparation of a new HTML page, and the insertion of specific data therein, and not the customization of a web page for a target device, as alleged in the Office Action.

Further, even if the *Traughber* method could be read as somehow customizing an HTML page for a particular target device (which Applicant does not concede), such an overly broad

interpretation still would fail to teach or suggest the recited features, as *Traughber* is simply silent on the application of style sheets to a DOM on a server (or system) side. In fact, *Traughber* is completely silent regarding any use of any style sheet.

Therefore, the instant *Office Action* cannot reasonably support the position that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are obvious, because “to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-30 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-30.


If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/512,560

Attorney Docket # A8643 /
ST9-99-153

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 7, 2005